



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,766	10/23/2000	Mervin L. Grindahl	65936-5	7426
22504	7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER	
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP 2600 CENTURY SQUARE 1501 FOURTH AVENUE SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688				MATTIS, JASON E
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2665		

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Jew

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/694,766	GRINDAHL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason E. Mattis	2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16, 58 and 60-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16, 58, and 60-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 9/6/05. Due to the amendment, the previous rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph has been withdrawn. Claims 1-16, 58, and 60-65 are currently pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 58 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Lines 5-7 of **claim 58** state “wherein a distance separating individual ones of the plurality of base stations increases by a factor of two times an order of signal modulation”. It is not clear from the specification or the claims what is meant by “an order of signal modulation”.

Lines 10-14 of **claim 65** state “wherein a modulation scheme is selected to achieve a desired bit error rate and wherein a required signal to noise ration increases as an order of modulation increases. It is not clear from the specification or the claims what is meant by “an order of modulation”.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. (U.S. Pat. 5867485) in view of *Design of a 100 MBPS Wireless Local Area Network* by Engels et al. from URSI Symposium on Signals, Systems, and Electronics Issue 98, 1998.

**With respect to claim 9**, Chambers et al. discloses a wireless access system comprising an outdoor base station unit, remote node transceiver 14, that includes a network interface, fiber optic links 12 (**See column 6 lines 1-8 and items 12 and 14 in Figure 2 for reference to remote node transceiver 14, which is an outdoor base station including a fiber optic link 12**). Chambers et al. also discloses a radio frequency interface and a switch capable of switching an information packet to the base station, remote node transceiver 14, from the network, fiber optic network, and from the base station to the network (**See column 6 line 1 to column 7 line 51 and Figure 3 of Chambers et al. for reference to radio frequency transmit and receive antennas, which are capable of transmitting and receiving data packets via radio frequency**

**and for reference to fiber optic receivers, which inherently includes a packet switch, for sending and receiving packets to and from the fiber optic network).**

Chambers et al. further discloses a customer premise equipment, subscriber station, including a host interface, network interface unit 60, and an outdoor antenna (**See column 7 line 54 to column 8 line 21 and Figures 4 and 5 of Chambers et al. for reference to the subscriber station containing an indoor NIU 60 and an outdoor**).

Chambers et al. also discloses a second radio frequency interface and a second switch to send and receive packets between the host, subscriber, equipment and the radio frequency interface (**See column 7 line 54 to column 9 line 57 and Figures 4 and 5 of Chambers et al. for reference to a roof mounted radio frequency antenna and its equipment, which transfers packets from the antenna to the subscriber equipment as well as from the subscriber equipment to the antenna, and which must include a packet switch to be able to perform the function of sending data to and from the host equipment using NIU 60**). Chambers et al. further discloses using orthogonal frequency division multiplexing to transmit and receive packets (**See column 4 lines 37-48 of Chambers et al. for reference to using OFDM**). Chambers et al. does not disclose that the second radio frequency interface enables non-line-of-sight radio frequency transmission.

**With respect to claim 9, Engels et al. discloses a wireless communication system using OFDM in which non-line-of-sight antennas are used for radio transmissions in an indoor environment (See the abstract and introduction sections of Engels et al. for reference to an OFDM indoor communication system that uses**

**non-line-of-sight transmissions to base stations).** Using an OFDM wireless communication system in which non-line-of-sight antennas are used for radio transmission in an indoor environment has the advantage of allowing transmitters to be more flexibly placed without having to provide a line-of-sight between the transmitters and the base stations.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Engels et al. to combine using an OFDM wireless communication system in which non-line-of-sight antennas are used for radio transmission in an indoor environment, as suggested by Engels et al., with the system and method of Chambers et al., with the motivation being to allow transmitters to be more flexibly placed without having to provide a line-of-sight between the transmitters and the base stations.

**With respect to claim 10,** Chambers et al. discloses that the host is either a single host computer or a network of host computers (**See column 9 lines 23-39 and item 64 of Figure 4 for reference to the host being a computer**).

**With respect to claim 11,** Chambers et al. discloses that the radio frequency interfaces operates in the 2.5-2.686 GHz range (**See column 2 lines 62-64 of Chambers et al. for reference to operating in frequency ranges of 2150-2162 MHz and 2500-2686 MHz**).

**With respect to claim 12,** Chambers et al. that the network and host interface comprise an Ethernet interface (**See column 9 line 23-39 and item 64 of Figure 4 of**

**Chambers et al. for reference to using Ethernet, which inherently means there must be an Ethernet interface in the NIU 60 and the PC 64).**

3. Claims 60-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. in view of Schreiber et al. (U.S. Pat. 5425050).

**With respect to claim 60**, Chambers et al. discloses a wireless system with a plurality of computer premise equipment units, subscriber stations 16, and a plurality of base station units, remote node transceivers 14, with the CPEs communicate with the base stations using radio frequency (**See column 4 line 64 to column 5 line 9 and items 14 and 16 in Figure 1 for reference to remote node transceivers 14 communicating with subscriber stations 16 using radio frequency energy**).

Chambers also discloses that the base station units are arranged in a sectorized configuration with up to 250 CPE units in each sector (**See column 3 lines 10-28, column 7 lines 1-4, and Figure 1 of Chambers et al. for reference to the remote node transceivers 14 having sectors and for reference to transceivers connected to a number of subscribers in the range of 10-100, which is under 250**). Chambers et al. does not disclose a coverage area for a base station having a radius of more than one mile and less than 10 miles.

**With respect to claim 60**, Schreiber et al., in the field of communications, discloses a base station having a coverage area with a radius of more than one mile and less than ten miles (**See column 13 line 58 to column 14 line 17 and Figure 8 of Schreiber et al. for reference to cell coverage areas being several miles across to**

**provide an acceptable signal to noise ratio as shown in Figure 8).** Using a base station having a coverage area with a radius of more than one mile and less than ten miles has the advantage of providing a coverage area for an OFDM base station with an acceptably large signal to noise ratio.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Schreiber et al., to combine using a base station having a coverage area with a radius of more than one mile and less than ten miles, as suggested by Schreiber et al., with the system and method of Chambers et al., with the motivation being to provide a coverage area for an OFDM base station with an acceptably large signal to noise ratio.

**With respect to claim 61**, Chambers et al. discloses that the sectorized configuration is maintained in a cellular configuration (**See column 7 lines 1-12 of Chambers et al. for reference to the sectors being in a cellular configuration**).

**With respect to claim 62**, Chambers et al. discloses that there can be six sectors per cell (**See column 7 lines 1-4 of Chambers et al. for reference to there being at least 3 sectors, which includes the possibility of six sectors**).

**With respect to claim 63**, Chambers et al discloses that the cellular configuration has a 1:1 reuse pattern (**See column 7 lines 12-25 of Chambers et al. for reference to frequency reuse factors of one**).

4. Claims 1, 5-6, 8, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. in view of Schreiber et al. and in further view of Engels et al.

With respect to claim 1, Chambers et al. discloses a microcellular network operating in a frequency range of less than 10 GHz (**See column 2 lines 62-64 of Chambers et al. for reference to operating in frequency ranges of 2150-2162 MHz and 2500-2686 MHz**). Chambers et al. also discloses a plurality of base stations, remote node transceivers 14 (**See column 4 line 64 to column 5 line 9 and Figure 1 of Chambers et al. for reference to remote node transceivers 14**). Chambers et al. further discloses communicating using OFDM on a set of frequency channels (**See column 4 lines 38-47 of Chambers et al. for reference to using OFDM**). Chambers et al. further discloses a plurality of consumer premise equipment, subscriber stations 16, assigned to base stations and located in the coverage area of the base stations (**See column 4 line 64 to column 5 line 9 and Figure 1 of Chambers et al. for reference to subscriber stations 16 in the coverage area of remote node transceivers 14**). Chambers et al. does not disclose the base stations having a coverage area between 1 and 10 miles. Chambers et al. also does not disclose the consumer premise equipment having an antenna deployed internally within the premise where the CPE is located.

With respect to claim 64, Chambers et al. discloses a microcellular network operating in a frequency range of less than 10 GHz (**See column 2 lines 62-64 of Chambers et al. for reference to operating in frequency ranges of 2150-2162 MHz and 2500-2686 MHz**). Chambers et al. also discloses a plurality of base stations, remote node transceivers 14 (**See column 4 line 64 to column 5 line 9 and Figure 1 of Chambers et al. for reference to remote node transceivers 14**). Chambers et al. further discloses the base stations having transmitters communicating using OFDM on a

set of frequency channels (**See column 4 lines 38-47 of Chambers et al. for reference to using OFDM**). Chambers et al. further discloses a plurality of consumer premise equipment, subscriber stations 16, assigned to base stations, having receivers to receive communications from the base stations, and located in the coverage area of the base stations (**See column 4 line 64 to column 5 line 9 and Figure 1 of Chambers et al. for reference to subscriber stations 16 in the coverage area of remote node transceivers 14**).

**With respect to claim 8**, Chambers does not disclose that the base station provides a signal to noise ration of at least 5 dB.

**With respect to claims 1, 8, and 64**, Schreiber et al., in the field of communications, discloses a base station having a coverage area with a radius of more than one mile and less than ten miles and a signal to noise ratio of at least 5dB (**See column 13 line 58 to column 14 line 17 and Figure 8 of Schreiber et al. for reference to cell coverage areas being several miles across to provide an acceptable signal to noise ratio as shown in Figure 8 with a signal to noise ratio when using a radius between 1 and 10 miles being 56 dB, which is more than 5dB**). Using a base station having a coverage area with a radius of more than one mile and less than ten miles has the advantage of providing a coverage area for an OFDM base station with an acceptably large signal to noise ratio.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Schreiber et al., to combine using a base station having a coverage area with a radius of more than one mile and less than ten

miles, as suggested by Schreiber et al., with the system and method of Chambers et al., with the motivation being to provide a coverage area for an OFDM base station with an acceptably large signal to noise ratio.

**With respect to claims 1 and 64**, Engels et al. discloses a wireless communication system using OFDM in which non-line-of-sight antennas are used for radio transmissions in an indoor environment (**See the abstract and introduction sections of Engels et al. for reference to an OFDM indoor communication system that uses non-line-of-sight transmissions to base stations**). Using an OFDM wireless communication system in which non-line-of-sight antennas are used for radio transmission in an indoor environment has the advantage of allowing transmitters to be more flexibly placed without having to provide a line-of-sight between the transmitters and the base stations.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Engels et al. to combine using an OFDM wireless communication system in which non-line-of-sight antennas are used for radio transmission in an indoor environment, as suggested by Engels et al., with the system and method of Chambers et al. and Schreiber et al., with the motivation being to allow transmitters to be more flexibly placed without having to provide a line-of-sight between the transmitters and the base stations.

**With respect to claim 5**, the combination of Chambers et al. discloses using an ALOHA medium access scheme (**See column 8 lines 48-50 of Chambers et al for reference to connection management being handled by a slotted aloha protocol**).

**With respect to claim 6**, Chambers et al. discloses each base station, remote node transceiver 14, including less than 10 sector-oriented antennas (**See column 7 lines 1-4 of Chambers et al. for reference to having at least 3 radiating sectors, which inherently must have at least 3 sector-oriented antennas**). Chambers et al. also discloses each sector-oriented antenna using a different set of channels (**See column 7 lines 1-12 of Chambers et al. for reference to sectors using cross polarization between adjacent cells, which implies that each sector uses a separate set of frequency channels to prevent interference**).

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. in view of Schreiber et al. and Engel et al. as applied to claims 1, 5-6,

and 64 above, and further in view of *Adaptive Antennas for OFDM* by Vook et al. from Vehicular Technology Conference, 48<sup>th</sup> IEEE Ottawa, Canada.

**With respect to claim 2**, the combination of Chambers et al. Schreiber et al. and Engel et al. does not disclose a bit error rejection rate of  $10 \times 10^{-6}$ .

**With respect to claim 2**, Vook et al., in the field of communications, suggest that lower bit error rate is more optimum and shows a BER of  $10 \times 10^{-6}$  as optimum (**See page 608-610 and Figure 3 for reference to optimum BER approaching  $10 \times 10^{-6}$** ). Having a lower BER has the advantage of having less corrupt packet data in the wireless network.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Vook et al., to combine the BER of  $10 \times 10^{-6}$  as suggested by Vook et al., with the wireless system of Chambers et al. Schreiber et al. and Engel et al., with the motivation being to have less corrupt packet data in the network.

**With respect to claim 3**, Chambers et al. discloses using QPSK (**See column 7 lines 42-45 of Chambers et al. for reference to using QPSK**).

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. in view of Schreiber et al. and Engel et al. as applied to claims 1, 5-6, and 64 above, and further in view of *Radio Resources Allocation in Fixed Broadband Wireless Networks* by Fong et al. from IEEE Transactions on Communications Vol. 46 No. 6.

**With respect to claim 4**, the combination of Chambers et al. Schreiber et al. and Engel et al. does not disclose channels of a first base station being reused by a second adjacent base station.

**With respect to claim 4**, Fong et al., in the field of communications, discloses reusing channels in adjacent base stations (**See page 806 right hand column of Fong et al. for reference to reusing channels in every cell, which includes adjacent cells**). Reusing channels has the advantage of leaving more channels available for use in each base station.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Fong et al., to combine the reuse of channels in adjacent base stations, with the wireless system of Chambers et al. Schreiber et al. and Engel et al., with the motivation being to leave more channels available for use in each base station.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. in view of Schreiber et al. and Engel et al. as applied to claims 1, 5-6, and 64 above, and further in view of Deutsche (GB 2319709).

**With respect to claim 7**, the combination of Chambers et al. Schreiber et al. and Engel et al. does not disclose an efficiency ratio being at least 0.75.

**With respect to claim 7**, Deutsche, in the field of communications, discloses an efficiency ratio of at least 0.75 (**See page 5 lines 6-7 of Deutsche for reference to an**

**efficiency of about 0.75 bits/s/Hz per channel).** Having a high efficiency ratio has the advantage of lowering the amount of transmitter power needed in a base station.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Deutsche, to combine the a system with an efficiency ratio of 0.75, with the wireless system of Chambers et al. Schreiber et al. and Engel et al., with the motivation being to lower the amount of transmitter power needed in a base station of the system.

8. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chambers et al. in view of Schreiber et al. as applied to claims 9-12 above, and further in view of Seazholtz et al. (U.S. Pat. 6246875).

**With respect to claim 13,** Chambers et al. discloses base stations, remote node transceivers 14, arranged in a cellular structure (**See column 3 lines 10-28 and item 14 in Figure 1 of Chambers et al. for reference to remote node transceivers arranged as cells in a network architecture**). The remote node transceivers 14 must inherently emit a signal to be able to communicate with the subscriber stations 16. The subscriber stations 16 also must inherently register with the remote node transceivers in some way to be able to send data packets to the remote node transceivers 14. The combination of Chambers et al. and Schreiber et al. does not disclose CPE units registering with base stations based on signal quality of the signal from the base station units.

**With respect to claim 14,** the combination of Chambers et al. and Schreiber et al. does not disclose CPE units searching for and registering with a new base station based on signal quality upon losing signal quality with the current registered base station.

**With respect to claim 16,** the combination of Chambers et al. and Schreiber et al. does not disclose that when a CPE unit registers with a new base station unit, the new base station unit cause updating of the base station unit to which the CPE unit was previously registered, making it aware of the new registration.

With respect to claims 13-14 and 16, Seazholtz et al., in the field of communications, discloses a CPE, end user station, registering with a base station, mobile data base station, based on quality of the signal (**See column 34 lines 1-17 of Seazholtz et al. for reference to an end user station registering with a mobile data base station based on signal strength**). Seazholtz et al. also discloses searching for and registering with a new base station when the current base station is losing signal quality (**See column 18 lines 23-51 of Seazholtz et al. for reference to handing off to a new base station when the signal of the current base station is weakening based on the signal strength of the new base station**). Seazholtz et al. further discloses updating of a subscriber list to make base stations aware of a mobile unit registering with a new base station (**See column 19 lines 18-28 of Seazholtz et al. for reference to updating a SID list when mobiles units register with new stations**). Registering with base stations based on signal quality and providing indication that a CPE unit has registered with a new base station has the advantage of improving system

performance by making sure communications are made using the strongest possible signal and making sure that each base station in the system can accurately route packets to CPE units which have change the base station they are registered to.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Seazholtz et al. to combine register based on signal strength and making base station units aware of changing registrations, as suggested by Seazholtz et al., with the communications system of Chambers et al. and Schreiber et al., with the motivation being to improve system performance by making sure communications are made using the strongest possible signal and making sure that each base station in the system can accurately route packets to CPE units which have change the base station they are registered to.

**With respect to claim 15**, the CPE units, subscriber stations 16 of Chambers et al., must inherently pass the address of the host connected to it to the base station unit, remote node transceiver 14, as with any network, so that the base station unit will be able to correctly route packets which are destined for the host address.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 58, and 65 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9/6/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that:

"Those skilled in the art will recognize that difference in the technology between Chambers, Schreiber, and Engels are not capable of combination in the manner suggested in the Office Action. Specifically, Chambers is directed to a low power micro cellular wireless interactive network having a defined coverage area of 1000-2000 feet. (See column 3, lines 21-25.) In contrast, Schreiber is not an interactive system at all, but is directed to a one way television transmission system having a range exceeding 40 miles. (See Figure 8 column 10, line 59-column 11 line 33.) The teachings of these two references are incompatible and not capable of combination in the manner suggested in the Office Action where only selected bits and pieces of each reference are considered. When the teachings of Chambers and Schreiber are considered in their entirety, they are incapable of combination suggested in the Office Action. Similarly, Engels is directed solely to an indoor communication system. (See Abstract, page 253) Engels describes the design parameters of a modem capable of such indoor operation, but does not teach or suggest a plurality of base stations and a plurality of consumer premise equipment, as recited

in claim 1. Furthermore, it should be noted that Engels teaches directly away from the claimed system in stating that the network uses TDMA in the uplink and OFDMA in the downlink. (See page 254, column 1.)” (See pages 9-10 of Applicant’s Remarks)

the Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, it is noted that the combinations the Chambers, Schreiber, and Engels reference used above are not a physical combination of the complete systems disclosed by those references. The combinations are based on the system disclosed in the Chambers reference and teachings found in both the Schreiber and Engels reference. The Schreiber reference is used merely as a teaching of using a base station radius that is between one and ten miles. Therefore, it is the disclosed used coverage area of Schreiber that is combined with the system and method of Chambers, not the entire system of Schreiber. Similarly, the Engels reference is used merely as a teaching of non line of sight internally deployed antennas. Therefore, it is the disclosed use of a non line of sight internally deployed antenna of Engels that is combined with the system and method of Chambers, not the entire system. Therefore, the combinations of Chambers, Schreiber, and Engels used in the rejections above are proper.

In response to the Applicant’s argument that:

“However, the cited section (column 13 line 58-column 14 line 17 and Figure 8) describes a temporal spread of signals due to the fact that all transmitters transmit the same signal on the same frequency. Schreiber describes a temporal spread of the cells were “several miles across.” This

phrase is ambiguous and does not teach a limitation of greater than 1 mile and less than 10 miles. The term "several" is very subjective and ambiguous. However, Figure 8, also cited in the Office Action, clearly illustrates a range exceeding 40 miles. This is unambiguous." (See pages 11-12 of Applicant's Remarks)

the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the phrase "several mile across" may be ambiguous, the Schreiber reference does provide other evidence of using a cell radius between 1 and 10 miles. For example, column 13 line 58 to column 14 line 17 discloses a temporal spread, which is the time for an electromagnetic wave to travel 2 or 3 cell diameters, being as large as 50 or 100 microseconds. Using this information and using the fact that the electromagnetic waves will travel at approximately the speed of light (approximately 186,282.4 miles per second) it is possible to determine the cell radii used. For example, using the 50 microseconds temporal spread, and assuming that the temporal spread is the time for the electromagnetic wave to travel 3 cell diameters (or 6 cell radii) it is found that the cell radius is 186282.4 miles per second times 50 microseconds divided by 6 cell radii, which equals approximately 1.55 miles. Similarly, using the 100 microseconds temporal spread, and assuming that the temporal spread is the time for the electromagnetic wave to travel 2 cell diameters (or 4 cell radii) it is found that the cell radius is 186282.4 miles per second times 100 microseconds divided by 4 cell radii, which equals approximately 4.66 miles. Since these radii are within the claimed range, Schreiber does unambiguously disclose using a base station having a coverage radius of more than 1 mile and less than 10 miles.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason E. Mattis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3154. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jem



HUY D. VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600